

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-25, and 27-33 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 23, and 29 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 18, 27, and 29 are sought to be amended. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner states, on page 2 of the Office Action, that claims 1-3, 5-7, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. For example, the Examiner states that “[a]lthough claim 1 recites a location associated with a computing device, but the receiving a location request from a requestor is not specified or carried out by a computing device.” Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7, and 29 to overcome this rejection. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review amended independent claims 1, 7, and 29, and withdraw this rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner states, on page 6 of the Office Action, that claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-25, and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

No. 6,505,048 to Moles *et al.* (hereinafter “Moles”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,279 to Herz.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner states that Moles substantially teaches Applicants’ invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. Moles does not teach or suggest Applicants’ claimed element of: “if privacy preferences associated with the requestor have not been specified, requesting the privacy preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor.”

Moles does not teach or suggest “...privacy preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor.” Unlike the present invention, Moles teaches one location privacy flag that is either set to not transmit the location of the wireless mobile station or not set to transmit the location of the wireless mobile station. *Moles*, col. 6, line 56 – col. 7, line 5. Thus, unlike the present invention, Moles does not associate privacy preferences with each of the plurality of location properties, which enables privacy preferences to indicate location properties to be shared and/or location properties to be blocked. Instead, Moles teaches one privacy flag to determine whether information concerning the location of the wireless mobile station (latitude and longitude) is to be transmitted. *Moles*, col. 2, line 60 – col. 3, line 2; col. 6, line 56 – col. 7, line 5;

The Examiner then states, on page 8 of the Office Action, that “Moles [does] not clearly explain the claimed requesting a privacy preference associated with the requestor

if a privacy preference associated with the requestor has not been specified.” The Examiner further states Herz in combination with Moles teaches this element.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Moles does not teach this element and the combination of Herz with Moles does not solve the deficiencies of Moles. Unlike the present invention, which teaches “if privacy preferences associated with the requestor have not been specified, requesting the privacy preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor.” As indicated above, Moles teaches a location privacy flag 272 and that:

“[t]he user can selectively set the value of location privacy flag 272 by entering data through keypad 250 in response to a menu displayed on display unit 255. For example, a user can type the letters ‘no’ on keypad 250 in response to a question on a transmission status menu (not shown) on display unit 255 asking whether location information is to be transmitted. Later, if the user desires to allow the transmission of location information, the user can access the transmission status menu and type the letters ‘yes’ in response to the same question on the transmission status menu.”

Moles, col. 6, line 60 – col. 7, line 3.

Thus, unlike the present invention, Moles requires the user to access the transmission status menu to answer the question of whether location information is to be transmitted.

The Examiner cites Herz, col. 13, lines 30-42, col. 14, line 15-17, col. 15, lines 4-6, 11-36, and col. 16, lines 1-7 as support for combining Herz with Moles to suggest the element of “if privacy preferences associated with the requestor have not been specified, requesting the privacy preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor.” Applicants

respectfully disagree. These sections of Herz teach User to User Introductions where user to user automatic matching techniques already used (i.e., similar user profiles, similar common interest venues, complimentary attributes within the user profiles in which there is complementarity in knowledge or skill sets by which tasks and/or knowledge sharing is the primary objective, etc.) can be improved by using location enhanced information. Herz, col. 13, line 18–47. The location enhanced information allows for notifying users of other users that are located in or near the same vicinity to match profile conditions consistent with privacy policies of the users. *Id.* Thus, Herz uses location information to notify users of other users that are located in or near the same vicinity. It does not teach or suggest “if privacy preferences associated with the requestor have not been specified, *requesting the privacy preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor.*”

One section of Herz cited by the Examiner states that “[t]here are numerous applications in which knowledge of location proximity between prospective parties which otherwise meet certain specified criteria for purposes of introduction, task and query, assignment or other applications in which matching similar or appropriately complementary individuals occurs are certainly too numerous to describe.” Herz, col. 14, lines 13-19. Thus, this section of Herz only indicates that there are numerous applications for which knowledge of location proximity is useful in *matching* similar or appropriately complementary individuals. It does not teach or suggest “if privacy preferences associated with the requestor have not been specified, requesting the privacy

preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor.”

Another section of Herz cited by the Examiner discloses that “[q]ueries or task requirements in the form of requests may also be submitted in addition to (or in place of) the requestor’s user profile.” Herz, col. 15, lines 4-6. Thus, this section of Herz indicates additional information to be submitted for purposes of matching individuals, not “if privacy preferences associated with the requestor have not been specified, requesting the privacy preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor,” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Another section of Herz cited by the Examiner discloses that:

access control criteria dictating profile access and reachability of the user (via physical or virtual introduction or receipt of a message) may be controlled accordingly based upon the profile of the requestor (as is disclosed) and/or the nature of his/her request (or other message). Similarly, such access controls may be used to enable (or restrict) the ability of an explicitly identified user (UID) to be automatically identified upon his/her entering the same physical proximity of the requestor. As is suggested in the above referenced patent, a further means by which users may access user profiles includes (subject to access approval), assigning of user profiles (which are typically pseudonymized) according to appropriate cluster (or attribute) criteria (including location criteria) and the construction of conveniently navigable hierarchical menus. Virtual tags may also be ascribed by users to physical objects (or potentially even other users) where an XML representation is constructed with a (future) location tag which can be automatically indexed by future users at that location. Such information could relate to a variety of rating criteria (which could be averaged across users) and/or annotations (potentially even hazards). It may be associated with rules dictating the user’s disclosure policy with respect to which user(s) or user type may gain

access to which information (e.g., who can access the identity or profile information associated with the tag.)
Herz, col. 15, lines 11-36.

Unlike the present invention, this section of Herz discloses that profile access and the reachability of the user (via physical or virtual introductions, or receipt of a message) may be controlled based upon the profile of the requestor and the nature of the request, not “if privacy preferences associated with the requestor have not been specified, requesting the privacy preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor,” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

The last section of Herz cited by the Examiner states that:

[i]f a vendor meets certain user pre-defined access criteria via features and credentials, user profile data may be accessed in accordance with the user’s privacy policy. Data mining tools can be used to enable advertisers to identify relevant features. Advertisers may enter rules that specify how users are to be targeted, based on desired criteria such as those pseudonyms that posses certain attributes.”
Herz, col. 16, lines 1-7.

Thus, unlike the present invention, this section of Herz discloses vendor access to user profile data based on the user’s privacy policy and that data mining tools can be used to enable advertisers to identify relevant features, not “if privacy preferences associated with the requestor have not been specified, requesting the privacy preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor,” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Thus, neither Moles nor Herz, separately or in combination, teach the element of “if privacy preferences associated with the requestor have not been specified, requesting the privacy preferences associated with each of the plurality of location properties for the requestor from the user, wherein the privacy preferences indicate location information to be shared with and/or blocked from the requestor”, as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom (2, 3, 5, 6, 32, and 33), are patentable over Moles and Herz. Independent claims 7, 13, 18, 23 and 29 include a similar claim element to that argued above with respect to claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 7, 13, 18, 23 and 29, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 8-12, 15-17, 19-22, 21-25 and 27-28, and 30-31, respectively) are also patentable over Moles and Herz. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/
Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
(202) 588-1959

Dated: November 19, 2010

Intel Corporation
Customer Number 59796
c/o CPA Global
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402